DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 734 UD 025 310

TITLE	Chapter 1 Project Identification Program. Lafayette School Corporation.
INSTITUTION	Lafayette School Corp., IN.
PUB DATE	2 Feb 86
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Exceptional Persons; *High Risk Students; Individualized Education Programs; *Kindergarten; Learning Problems; Parent Participation; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Skill Development
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Indiana (Lafayette)

ABSTRACT

The Kindergarten Intensified Development System (KIDS) Chapter 1 program of the Lafayette, Indiana, School Corporation is described in terms of the following: (1) district information; (2) state agency program information; (3) project information including staff degrees and experience, education needs, student selection, and participating schools; (4) project goals and objectives; (5) coordination with regular school programs; (6) parent community involvement; (7) professional development and training; (8) leadership; (9) instructional materials, methods, and approaches; (10) expectations for student learning and behavior; (11) classroom climate; (12) use of academic time; (13) student progress monitoring; (14) regular feedback and reinforcement; (15) recognition of, and rewards for, excellence; (16) evaluation results; and (17) project effectiveness and achievement. Evaluation results show a gain on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills and above average performance on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts. Since the students were from a predominately low socioeconomic background and as a group were identified as developmentally at risk, these improved scores are significant. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278734

CHAPTER I PROJECT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM

LAFAYETTE SCHOOL CORPORATION

UD025310

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lubee Nelson
Lafayette School Corp.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

12-16-86

CHAPTER 1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM

COVER SHEET

Local Superintendent's or Chief Operating Officer's Name (Mrs., Miss, Ms., Mr., Dr.)

Mr. James Wagner

Education Agency's Name Lafayette School Corporation

Address 2300 Cason Street
Lafayette, Indiana 47905

Telephone Number (317) 448-4640 Congressional District(s) 7

I have reviewed the information contained on this form and, to the best of my knowledge, it is accurate.

James J. Wagner Date 2/7/86
Superintendent's Signature

****

Chapter 1 Coordinator's Name (or other official responsible for project administration) (Mrs., Miss, Ms., Mr., Dr.)

Mrs. Lubee Nelson

Address 700 South 4th
Lafayette, Indiana 47905

Telephone Number (317) 742-2015

Date of most recent SEA on-site review of project November 17, 1983

I have reviewed the information contained on this form and, to the best of my knowledge, it is accurate.

Lubee Nelson Date 2/7/86
Chapter 1 Coordinator's Signature

UD035 210

State _____

Chief State School Officer's Name (Mrs., Miss, Ms., Mr., Dr.)

_____

Address _____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

Telephone Number ( ) _____ _____

I hereby nominate this project fo onsideration under the Chapter 1 Project Identification Program. To the b . of my knowledge, the information contained in this form is accurate, and the oject is being implemented in compliance with Federal requirements.

_____ _____ Date _____
Chief State School Office 's Signature

********** **********

Name and Title of Person(s) comp ting form

Lubee Nelson, Project ordinator
Nancy Bakes, Reading C rdinator
JoAnne McDonald, Readi Coordinator
_____ _____

Ia. DISTRICT INFORMATION

(Complete if project operates in a local school district, unless project is a State administered migrant program. State agency programs should be described on the next page.)

A. District Name Lafayette School Corporation

Name of Contact Person Lubee Nelson

Telephone Number (317) 742-2015

B. Descriptive Information for the 1984-85 school year.

1. Total district enrollment 7437

2. Total number of classroom teachers 499 (certified staff minus administrators)

3. Grades or equivalent education span of district K-12

4. What is the racial/ethnic composition of the student body in your district/agency?

.2	% American Indian or Native Alaskan
.7	% Asian or Pacific Islander
1.3	% Hispanic
2.2	% Black, not of Hispanic Origin
95.6	% White, not of Hispanic Origin

5. Total population in school district 44,754

6. In general, how would you classify the district?

Rural _____ Small town _____

Suburban _____ Urban xx

7. What percentage of the students in your district comes from low-income families? 14% (Please indicate how you determined this number.)

Target Area selection was conducted in May, 1984. The survey indicates the resident count and the number of students who received free lunches.

8. Please describe briefly any significant changes that have occurred in these student figures during the last 3-5 years.

No significant changes.

15. STATE AGENCY PROGRAM INFORMATION
(Complete if project is operated by a State agency.)

A. Agency Name _____

Name of Contact Person _____

Telephone number ( ) _____

B. Type of Agency

State Educational Agency _____
State Institution/Delinquent _____
State Institution/Neglected _____
State Institution/Handicapped _____
Other (Specify) _____

C. Descriptive Information for the 1984-85 School Year

1. Number of institutions participating in State agency program _____

2. Number of institutions participating in the nominated program _____

3. Total number of classroom teachers _____

4. Grades or equivalent span of participating institution(s) _____

5. What is the racial/ethnic composition of the student body in the institution(s)?

_____% American Indian or Native Alaskan
_____% Asian or Pacific Islander
_____% Hispanic
_____% Black, not of Hispanic Origin
_____% White, not of Hispanic Origin

Ic. PROJECT INFORMATION
(Everyone must complete this section.)

A. Project Title: KIDS (Kindergarten Intensified Development System)

B. Program Category

Basic Grants to LEA xx
Migrant Education _____ Section 141 _____
Section 143 _____
Neglected/Delinquent _____
Handicapped _____

C. Area(s) of Service Submitted

Reading xx
Mathematics _____
Oral Language _____
Other Language Arts _____
Other (Specify) _____

D. Number of children participating from public school(s) 48
and nonpublic school(s) 0 (No non-public children were educationally eligible for the program).

E. Grade level(s) or equivalent span of children receiving project services Kindergarten

F. Number of staff in the Chapter 1 project.
teachers 4
aides 4
volunteers 0
Coordinators 3

Describe the average educational (level) background, e.g., degree, experience, training of the teachers and education aides in the Chapter 1 project.

See Attached Sheet

G. School year(s) for which this project is being nominated (must include school year 1984-85). 1984-85

H. Estimated Chapter 1 annual per pupil cost to conduct this project in school year 1984-85. $1381 (does not include fixed charges)

I. What are the primary educational needs of the particular group of students served by your Chapter 1 project? Please indicate how these needs were determined and whether there are ongoing procedures for reviewing their relevance.

(Use additional sheet if necessary.)

The purpose of the project is to better prepare children for a successful school experience by increasing instructional time and supplementing the regular program in the areas of oral language development, reading readiness, gross motor, fine motor. General needs were determined through a meeting of administrators, assistant superintendent for instruction, and reading coordinators.

F. Staff in the Chapter 1 Program

Position		Degrees	Experience
KIDS Project Director and Reading Coordinator	A	BA MS+30	11 years classroom grades 4 and 5 9 years C-I Coordinator
KIDS Reading Coordinator	B	BA MS	6 years classroom grades 5 and 6 9 years Reading Coordinator
KIDS Reading Coordinator	C	BA MS	5 years classroom grades 4, 5 and 6 8 years Reading Coordinator
KIDS Kindergarten Teacher	D	BA MS+3	3 years classroom (kdg.)
KIDS Kindergarten Teacher	E	BS	3 years classroom (kdg.)
KIDS Kindergarten Teacher	F	BA MS	23 years classroom (kdg.)
KIDS Kindergarten Teacher	G	BA	21 years classroom (kdg.)
KIDS Reading Aide	H		1 year classroom aide 3 years Chapter I aide 2 years KIDS aide
KIDS Reading Aide	I		2 years Headstart Coordinator 1 year substitute teacher 4 years preschool teacher 1 year KIDS aide
KIDS Reading Aide	J		4½ years special ed. classroom aide 2 years KIDS aide
KIDS Reading Aide	K		4 years special ed. classroom aide 1 year KIDS aide

I. Education Needs

Specific needs were determined through the Metropolitan Readiness Test and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. All project staff evaluate the program annually through a written questionnaire and an evaluation meeting which includes administrators, assistant superintendent for instruction, reading coordinators, kindergarten teachers, and kindergarten aides.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J. **Describe how students are selected for the Chapter 1 project.**
Children are selected on the basis of three tests which are administered during the first three weeks of school each fall. Children must qualify on all three measures. Those greatest in need of services must be served first.

Boehm Test of Basic Concepts	below 35%ile (Aug.-Dec.) below 65%ile (Jan.-Mar. 15)
Brigance K and 1 Screen (Modified)	scores 65 or below (Aug. - Dec.) scores 80 or below (Jan. - Mar. 15)
Alphabet	recognizes less than 50% (Aug.-Dec.) recognizes less than 75% (Jan.-Mar. 15)

K. **List the names of the schools or institutions participating in the Chapter 1 project, and if it is an LEA project, the percentage of children from low-income families for each school during school year 1984-85.**

(Use additional sheet if necessary.)

Name	% of children from low-income families
Linnwood	31
Miller	33
Washington	38

II.
Project Description/Attributes of Success

*1. Clear Project Goals and Objectives

The full day extended day Chapter I kindergarten program enables more time to be spent on broadening as well as reinforcing the numerous learning experiences necessary for the maximum growth and development of each student. Program goals include:

1. To provide time for a wider range of instructional activities.
2. To provide time for personalized instruction.
3. To provide time for direct teaching of concept application and problem solving skills.
4. To maximize growth in the areas of communication, motor, and reading readiness.
5. To supplement and reinforce the regular half-day kindergarten curriculum.
6. To mold social and emotional development.
7. To increase parent participation in concept reinforcement at home.
8. To increase parents' awareness of developmental stages.

These goals were formulated by one KIDS teacher and reading coordinator in the school where the program was piloted. The goals were subsequently approved by the superintendent and the Board of Education. They have been upheld through yearly evaluation meetings, involving all KIDS staff and yearly fall meetings with extended day kindergarten parents and through an annual general Chapter I parent meeting.

The first five project goals are monitored through formal and informal measures. The teachers implement a basic instructional strategy of teach, practice, test, review, retest. Formal and informal measures are used to assess the project goals. Formal measures include: Houghton Mifflin Reading Readiness Checkpoints and prior review of weekly lesson plans. Informal measures include observation of daily activities by both the teacher and aide and classroom visitations by the reading coordinator and principal in each of the three buildings.

The remaining three goals are monitored through frequent communication with parents. Formal parent/teacher conferences are scheduled two times per year. Reports that assess student progress are sent to parents every 3½ to 4 weeks.

2. Coordination With the Regular School Program

The full day program enables more time to be spent on broadening and reinforcing the numerous learning experiences necessary to meet the project goals. The additional time spent in the four curricular areas (oral language development, reading readiness,

gross motor, and fine motor) is to supplement the regular morning kindergarten curriculum. The student has the same teacher all day. The classroom teacher and aide work in conjunction with the reading coordinator on program planning and implementation. Particular percentages of time are devoted to each of the four areas: reading readiness 20%, oral language 36%, gross and fine motor development 31%. Lesson plans which confirm the program integration process are on file.

The weekly schedules include time for the teacher and aide to plan. Conference time is available during the children's 30 minute rest time as well as an additional 25 minute period at the end of each day.

The reading coordinator in each of the participating schools monitors and helps supervise the program to insure that the program goals are being carried out and that the program is integrated with the regular kindergarten curriculum.

3. Parent/Community Involvement

A meeting is held each fall to acquaint parents with the extended day program. At this time program objectives and eligibility criteria are discussed along with general Chapter I information.

An audio-slide program was developed and presented to various parent groups and was presented at a school board meeting in the spring of 1983.

A newsletter is sent home three times per year. This includes information about the program, hints for parents, activities for parent and child, and a variety of timely articles relating to reading.

Formal parent/teacher conferences are scheduled two times per year (first and second semester). At this time the child's progress is reviewed and suggestions are provided for ways in which parents can help at home.

Report cards are sent home every 9 weeks. An additional Chapter I progress report is sent about 4½ weeks after the start of school and each 9 weeks thereafter. Parents receive a communication approximately every 4½ weeks.

Questionnaires are sent home in the spring to parents of all participating children to evaluate the program.

Informal notes and suggested activities for parent/child are sent home on an as needed basis.

Parents are encouraged to visit their child's program and to check out activity cards to use at home. The frequent communications with parents offer suggestions for ways in which parents can help strengthen their child's skills.

Activity booklets are distributed at yearly Chapter I meetings. A summer calendar of ideas has, also, been provided.

4. Professional Development and Training

Kindergarten teachers attended the state-wide Chapter I conference in the spring of 1985. Some of the sessions attended included:

1. "Academic Improvement Through Language Experience/Extended Day Kindergarten"

2. "Early Prevention of Reading Failure"

3. "Developmental Class oom: A Transition Between Kindergarten and First Grade"

4. "Learning Styles"

5. "Effective Utilizat n of Aides"

One of the physical ed ation teachers provided a 1½ hour workshop on "Gross Motor Activi es" for all KIDS staff (August 1985). This need had been expresse during the previous spring evaluation meeting.

Dr. James Baumann of P due University, Education Department, conducted a 1½ hour inservice fo all KIDS aides in August, 1985. The topic was "Instructional Tec iques To Use With Remedial Readers." The aides were given relea d time to attend the workshop. He will conduct another worksh in February, 1986. The topic is to be "Ways To Teach Compr ension".

All Chapter I aides par cipated in a State Department of Education, Division of Reading Eff tiveness, workshop for aides in the fall of 1985 (½ day released ti).

The Fall of 1985 Indiana niversity Language Arts conference was attended by the three coo dinators.

The local staff participates in local, state, regional, and national activities of the International Reading Association. The three reading coordinators attend the national conference yearly on a rotating basis. One of the reading coordinators has conducted workshops for the local reading council.

Informal inservice is conducted in each building on an as-needed basis by the reading coordinators.

Since this project continues into the current year, a variety of other conferences and workshops are attended throughout the year.

The project director is serving on the Chapter I State Advisory Committee.

Some of the professional affiliations that the staff has been involved with thus far include: Lafayette Education Association, Indiana State Teachers Association, National Education Association, International Reading Association, and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

5. Strong Leadership

The program is under the direction of the assistant superintendent for instruction, the principals, and building coordinators in each of the three participating schools. One of the coordinators is designated as the project director.

General program orientation meetings were held at the initiation of the program. Program guidelines were distributed and discussed.

Formal evaluation meetings are scheduled with the assistant superintendent, principals, teachers, instructional aides, and coordinators in the spring. A written evaluation form serves as a basis for discussion and for making recommendations for the following year.

Classroom teachers turn in weekly lesson plans to the coordinator in their building. Classrooms are visited periodically by principals and coordinators. The small size of our kindergarten classes (12) and the fact that the coordinator is full-time in each building greatly facilitates communication. Building coordinators and Chapter I staff communicate frequently concerning results of student testing, instructional programs, and materials.

*6. Appropriate Instructional Materials, Methods, and Approaches

The Extended Day program is an in-class program with one teacher and one aide assigned to work with a group of students no larger than twelve.

The additional time gained through a full day program is used to increase the time available for oral communication, motor, and readiness skills. Specific amounts of time have been allotted to these areas, with the understanding that specific activities may integrate several of the skill areas.

Results from the three screening measures used to place students into the program are also used by teachers for program planning. These screening measures include an alphabet checklist, the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, and a modified form of the Brigance Kindergarten Screening Instrument.

The classroom teacher is responsible for planning the daily activities. The teacher selects materials and methods to accomplish program goals.

The classroom teacher directs the activities of the instructional aide. The gross motor activity is planned by the teacher and carried out by the aide. The aide assists the teacher in activities relating to concept extension and reinforcement/reteaching of skills previously taught by the classroom teacher. In addition, the aide

helps locate and create materials to be used with the children, assists the teacher with encouraging children to follow discipline rules, checks student work, and observes and monitors children's progress during the teacher's lessons.

Materials are selected primarily by the classroom teachers. Building coordinators preview and make recommendations to classroom teachers concerning additional appropriate materials. Specific materials used vary from school to school, but some core materials are:

1. Boehm Basic Concepts Resource Kit, Psychological Corporation, 1971
2. Peabody Language Development Kit, Level P, AGS Company, 1981
3. The Letter Shop, The Hasty Pudding Puppet Company, 1980
4. Step Program, C. C. Publication Inc., 1976
5. I Can Series, Pelican Publishing Company, 1977
6. Alphabet Readiness Program, Addison Wesley, 1979
7. Happily Ever After Readiness Program, Addison Wesley, 1979
8. Daily Sensorimotor Training Activities, Educational Activities
9. Ginn English Program, Ginn and Company, 1977
10. Ready Steps Kit, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977
11. Getting Ready to Read Program and supplementary materials, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981

Parent Materials:

1. Helping Hands, Continental Press, Inc., 1977
2. The Bowdoin Program, Webster International, 1978
3. Growing Child, Dunn & Hargitt, Inc., 1978

7. High Expectations for Student Learning and Behavior

Small group activities are geared to the abilities of the students. Teachers form expectations based on their knowledge of the child's abilities. Students are expected to perform to the best of their abilities. Lessons are structured according to a four-phase cycle of instruction: teach, test, reteach, and retest. Alternate teaching/learning strategies that take different learning patterns and styles into consideration are used during initial instruction and reteaching.

The structure of the program enables the teacher to maintain high expectations for each child. The uniqueness of the program is that the same teacher is with the children all day and the additional time provides the opportunity for the needs of each child to be met.

Positive expectations for achievement and behavior are communicated through verbal praise, stickers, small rewards, Happy Grams, and classroom charts where mastery of a specific skill or behavior goal is noted.

*8. Positive School/Classroom Climate

One teacher and one aide working with a maximum of twelve children allow flexible grouping and facilitate an orderly environment where each child can receive individualized attention so that s/he can succeed to the best of his/her abilities. While the teacher instructs, both teacher and aide are able to observe and monitor the children carefully during lessons and are able to quickly provide assistance to children experiencing difficulty.

Lunchtime is an enjoyable break in the day for our children. Children have lunch in the classroom with the aide. Good table manners are encouraged. The aide uses opportunities to expand language and vocabulary through lunchtime conversation. The aide serves as an appropriate language model. Stories are read aloud to the children. Good health habits are encouraged through daily brushing of teeth. A rest time is provided before afternoon activities begin. Consideration of others and rules of courtesy are stressed throughout the day.

9. Maximum Use of Academic Time

The children participating in the extended day program have the possibility of an additional three hours and forty five minutes instructional time each day. Of this available time, 87% is spent in direct instructional interaction. This percentage is the result of comparing the actual instructional time spent in each of the four curricular areas to the total amount of available instructional time.

The minimum guideline of allotted time for each area is as follows: gross and fine motor activities - 60 minutes, oral language development - 40 minutes, and reading readiness - 35 minutes.

In practice these areas are integrated into the instructional process and are not taught as discreet units. The time allotments are used as a benchmark to assure that no one curricular unit is consistently slighted.

The 30 minute lunch period serves as an informal social time to enhance language development, health and nutritional awareness, and appropriate table manners. The instructional aide eats lunch with the children in a self-contained room. They are not physically part of the satellite lunch program, but do eat the same lunches as the rest of the school and can quality for free or reduced lunches.

The 30 minute rest period is the only part of the day that the students are not actively involved. Many full day programs have reported that a rest time is not necessary, and that children quickly become accustomed to going without a nap. The children qualifying for this program have a chronological but not developmental kindergarten age. Therefore, a rest time is a necessary part of the program.

The parent conferences, interim reports, checkout materials, monthly activity calendars, and the newsletters are the methods used to try to ensure reinforcement of instruction in the home. These methods are in attribute number three of this report.

*10. Closely Monitored Student Progress

Developmental need as determined through a battery of readiness tests is the only criteria for acceptance into this program. Thus, the student monitoring begins at this point. Initial lesson plans are developed from the information derived from the screening instruments. Weekly lesson plans are then developed by the teacher and instructional aide using both formal and informal assessments as to the children's progress. With the student to adult ratio kept to a maximum of 6:1, observation and informal assessment become very useful and valid tools, and are relied upon quite heavily in this program.

The Houghton Mifflin Reading Series is used throughout the school district with Level A being used in kindergarten for those children ready to start a basal series, and Ready Steps Kit used with the others. The Checkpoints tests, along with the Survey and Diagnostic Tests are used to determine the 80% mastery level required to progress through the program.

The instructional aide maintains a file on each of her students. An objectives checklist along with a materials list is updated each grading period. Information concerning formal and informal test results is recorded, as are any changes in instructional placement. Anecdotal records, parent conference summaries, representative papers, and any other information pertinent to the child's development are placed in the Chapter I file.

Progress charts for each instructional objective are prominently displayed in the room for quick reference by both teachers and parents, and as student motivators.

*11. Regular Feedback and Reinforcement

Parents are the child's first and most important teacher. To further the instruction at school and to provide an atmosphere for optimum development, parents need to be an integral part of the program.

Parent meetings or conferences are held at the beginning of the year to explain the program and review the results of the screening instruments.

A report card is sent home each nine weeks assessing the children over the regular kindergarten curriculum.

An interim report is sent home in the middle of each grading period. This report itemizes for the parents the strengths and weaknesses of their child's skill development. The report is objective specific to the extended day program. Included with this are activities that can be done at home to promote growth in the needed areas.

The school district provides time for one parent-teacher conference during the first semester. The extended day program includes another conference second semester. The parents have been very receptive to the conferencing with a contact rate of seventy five (75) percent.

Materials covering each of the developmental areas are available in each building for parents to checkout for home use. Master checklists are available for the parents to keep track of what lessons were done, when they were done, and how long it took to complete. The purpose is to encourage a positive and consistent home interaction.

In addition to the home materials for parents to use with their children, resource books and articles covering topics such as: parenting, discipline, social, and emotional growth are available for parental checkout.

Every month the children take home a calendar consisting of oral language activities for each day of the month. The speech and hearing clinician in one of the buildings provided these for the extended day students.

12. Excellence Recognized and Rewarded

Rewards for good work take many forms with kindergarten children. Candy, stickers, stamps or balloons are some of the tangible reinforcers used.

Good work can also earn privileges such as extra time for looking at books, working on the computer or Systems 80 machine, lunch helper, line leader, and paper helper.

The best papers are displayed on the Superman - Super Work Board, or another motivational bulletin board.

Verbal praise, especially if it is personalized, is a powerful reinforcer. In order to vary the responses, the list distributed by the Indiana Department of Education, "100 Ways to Say "Very Good", is used.

When the Superintendent, James Wagner, came to this school corporation, he instituted the GEM Award to recognize those that show excellence or, as he puts it, "Go the Extra Mile". The kindergarten teacher and Chapter I coordinator who wrote and piloted the extended day program received a GEM award to recognize their efforts.

Monthly notes inform the School Board of any innovative and/or creative projects that are taking place within the schools.

Directors of especially interesting projects are invited to present an educational report to the school board. The KIDS program was selected for one of the presentations.

13. Evaluation Results Used for Project Improvement

Pre-post test results were compiled for the extended day kindergarten students on two objective measures. Model A-1 evaluation format was used with a fall-spring testing cycle. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Monterey: CTBS/McGraw-Hill, 1981, Level A-Form U was administered in October of 1984 and in April of 1985. This test provided information in the following areas: visual recognition, sound recognition, vocabulary, oral comprehension, total reading, and math concepts/application.

The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1971 was administered in February of 1985 (Form B). The scores were compared to the average socio-economic norms established for the Boehm Tests.

These two tests were administered within the empirical norming period. The program was evaluated in the spring of 1985.

The program areas of staffing, curriculum, scheduling, materials, and screening have been evaluated. Surveys were distributed to parents of the children participating in the program and to program staff. Twenty-six parents and six staff members responded. A program review was held in the spring of 1985 with the assistant superintendent, building principals, kindergarten teachers, instructional aides, and Chapter I coordinators in attendance. Free discussion was encouraged with suggestions for enhancing the program the succeeding year.

A Parent Questionnaire was distributed to the parents at the end of the 1985 school year to ascertain their attitudes and beliefs about the extended day program versus the regular half-day kindergarten program. The results were shared with all Chapter I staff and principals at the program review meeting.

Of the parents who responded, over ninety percent agreed that the extended day program helped their child in the following areas:

-fine and gross motor skills
-self-confidence

Eighty percent felt the program had helped in these areas:

-social and emotional development
-gross motor skills
-following directions
-feeling a part of the school
-anticipation of first grade

Evaluating listening skills, attention span, and verbal expression divided the group with positive responses at sixty-nine percent, sixty-two percent, and seventy-three percent, respectively.

Eighty percent felt that the extended day class had sufficient merit to recommend it to other parents, and the same percentage agreed that their child did not become too tired going to school all day.

At the end of the questionnaire there was a place for parents to comment. The following are selected quotes from the questionnaire.

1. "I think my child has done well in kindergarten."

2. "My child listens well at home."

3. "Took time to adjust to but now handles all day well. Sleep schedule back to normal."

4. "I think kindergarten should be an all day program each and every year. It has helped the child and the parent in more ways than one."

5. "I feel the extended day class is great. I wish it had started for my other children. It's a great help."

6. "Due to the day that I saw you, I think that you know about my child. So I let you fill out this sheet. Thank you very much. Have a nice day."

Sixty-five percent of the parents took the time for a personal comment, and all of them were positive.

III.
Project Effectiveness and Achievement

Achievement gains for 1984-85 are given in Tables 1 and 2 below. In both tables the pre-post number represents those students that were present for at least seventy-five percent of the available instructional time. Enrollment in two of the schools is quite transient which is a factor to consider when interpreting the test results.

The first table gives information compiled on the 1981 edition of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) - Level A, Form U.

TABLE I

(Fall-Spring)

Building	#pre-post test	Average pre/post - NCE				
		Visual	Sound	Vocab.	Comp.	Total
Linnwood	11	31/33	26/41	41/46	36/59	34/53
Miller	7	31/41	45/45	36/29	34/33	32/30
Washington	14	38/53	40/43	44/52	39/55	39/54
Totals	32	34/43	36/43	41/45	37/52	36/48
±NCE (weighted)		+9	+7	+4	+15	+12

As the table shows, all the subtests and the total battery show gain with the comprehension section being most significant. The vocabulary subtest expected the children to be able to read words in fifty percent of the test items. Comprehension scores showed the greatest gain in reading readiness.

Table 2 shows the results of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, Form B (1971). The test was given in February, 1985 to correlate with the latest mid-year norming date. The middle socioeconomic norms were used. The scores represent mean raw scores and are compared to the norm group. The number of students is different because this test was given earlier in the year before some of the students moved.

Table 2

Building	# tested	Average raw score
Linnwood	11	36
Miller	10	36
Washington	19	39
Totals	40	38

The mean score of thirty-eight for the extended day students is 2.7 points higher than the mean score of the norm group (35.3), using the tables for the middle socioeconomic level. This corresponds to the 60th percentile for the extended day students and the 45th percentile for the norm group.

The pilot program began in the fall of 1983. After modifications were made the program was implemented in the three eligible Chapter I schools beginning in the fall of 1984.

The sustained effects study is in progress with data being available in 1987.

In summary the +12 NCE gain on the CTBS achievement test and the above average performance on the Boehm indicate the success of the extended day kindergarten program. Since these students are from a predominantly low socio-economic background and as a group were identified as developmentally at risk, this difference is significant.